

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Enclosed is a full set of replacement drawings with corrections as required in the Office
Action.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

REMARKS

The present Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action mailed April 4, 2006. Claims 1-12 and 20 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement directed to five different species of the invention. Applicants were required to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits. Applicants elected the embodiments of Group I as shown in FIGURES 1-4. Although the Examiner stated that no claims are generic, applicants believe that Claim 10 is generic to the embodiments shown in FIGURES 1-4 and FIGURES 8A-8B. The Examiner has withdrawn Claims 13-19. However, it appears that upon allowance of Claim 10, Claim 13 should remain in the application.

In the Office Action, the oath was indicated as being defective because it was not signed by each of the inventors. Applicants respectfully submit that the inventor Michael Boutillette executed the oath on June 14, 2004, inventor Dmitri Menn executed the oath on September 21, 2004, and inventor Eric Welch executed the oath on June 11, 2004. If the Examiner has any additional questions regarding the oath, he is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

The drawings were objected to because the reference characters 260 and 266 have both been used to designate a clip. In response, applicants have amended the specification to indicate that the reference number 260 refers to a guidewire retaining clip that maintains the guidewire in a coil when not being used by a physician, and the clip 266 refers to the mechanism that secures the jaws 262 and 264 together. It is, therefore, requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to the drawings.

In addition, the drawings were objected to because they include the reference character 224 shown in FIGURE 8B that is not mentioned in the description. Applicants have

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

amended the specification to indicate that reference number 224 refers to the bottom surface of the slider 216. Finally, applicants have amended FIGURE 9 to indicate that the ring is referenced by number 256. It is, therefore, requested that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings. A full set of replacement drawings with corrections is enclosed.

In the specification, the Examiner indicated that the channel 218 on page 7, line 30, should be slot 218. Applicants have made the change as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,030,349). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Nothing in the Wilson et al. device teaches or suggests a guidewire torquing device having an open channel extending along the length of the body and a slider that is longitudinally slidable within the channel as set forth in Claim 1. Because at least this element of Claim 1 is not taught or suggested in the '349 patent, it is submitted that the rejection of Claims 1-5 is in error.

Claims 10-12 were rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,057,186, to Hedger. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Nothing in the Hedger patent teaches or suggests the claimed combination of features including a wire torquing device having a body with an open channel extending along the length thereof. As can be seen in Figures 4 and 6 of the '186 patent, the device lacks an open channel. Because at least this feature is missing from the cited reference, it is submitted that the rejection of Claims 10-12 is in error.

Claims 1-2 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,533,772 to Scherts et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Nothing in the '772 patent teaches or suggests the claimed combination of features including a device for applying torque to a wire including a body portion having a channel with an opening that extends along the length of the body portion. As can be seen in Figures 1, 2 and 8 of the '772 patent, the

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

channel 22 in the Scherts et al. device is not open along the length thereof. Because the '772 patent does not disclose at least this feature, it is submitted that the rejection of Claims 1-2 and 7-8 is in error.

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. in view of Greive (U.S. Patent No. 6,059,484). Applicants respectfully submit that these claims depend on and further define allowable independent claims. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least this reason.

In addition, applicants have added new Claim 20 that depends from Claim 10. Because the cited prior art does not disclose the additional feature of Claim 20, the claim is allowable.

In light of the above, it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. It is, therefore, requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and pass this case to issue at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Rodney C. Tullett
Registration No. 34,034
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1730

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first-class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date: July 17, 2006 Patricia M. Tucker

RCT:mk

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100